

Five Questions in the History of the Tughluq Dynasty of Dihli

BY

LIEUT.-COL. SIR WOLSELEY HAIG

✓
[From the JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, *July, 1922.*]

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY 1922

PART III.—JULY

Five Questions in the History of the Tughluq Dynasty of Dihli

By LIEUT.-COL. SIR WOLSELEY HAIG, K.C.I.E., C.S.I.,
C.M.G., C.B.E.

OF the many questions connected with the history of the Tughluq dynasty of Dihli which have not been thoroughly investigated or conclusively determined I propose to deal in this paper with five, viz. :—

1. The name of the dynasty.
2. The facts of the rebellion of the army during the first expedition of Muḥammad Jauna (Ulugh Khān) to Warangal in A.D. 1321.
3. The reason for Sultān Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn's displeasure with his son Muḥammad Jauna during the expedition to Bengal, and the latter's responsibility for his father's death.
4. The chronology of the reign of Muḥammad Tughluq
5. The parentage of the child enthroned in Dihli by Alḥmad-i-Ayāz (Khvāja Jahān) after the death of Muḥammad Tughluq.

I. *The Name of the Dynasty*

On this subject Firishṭa writes (ii, 230): "The historians of India, both ancient and modern, have negligently omitted to record with the pen of investigation the origin and descent

of the Tughluq dynasty. The writer of these pages, Muḥammad Qāsim Firishṭa, when, at the beginning of the reign of Nūr-al-dīn Muḥammad Jahāngīr Pādshāh, he came as an envoy from the Sultān of the age, Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh (II), to the city of Lāhor, inquired of many people there who delighted in reading the history of the kings of Hindūstān and were well informed on the subject of the affairs of the Sultāns of India, what was the origin and descent of the Tughluq dynasty. They said that they also had failed to find in any book a clear statement on the subject, but that the tradition in that country was that Malik Tughluq, the father of the Emperor Ghīyās-al-dīn Tughluq Shāh, was one of the Turkī slaves of the emperor Ghīyās-al-dīn Balban, and formed an alliance with the Jats, who are natives of that country, and received from them a bride, of whom the emperor Ghīyās-al-dīn Tughluq Shāh was born. In the *Mulḥaqāt*¹ it is written that Tughluq was originally Qutluḡ, which is a Turkish word, and that the people of India, in pronouncing it, inverted it, and turned it into Tughluq, and some turn Qutluḡ into Qutlū.”

The *Khulāṣat-al-Tawārīkh* repeats the tradition that the mother of Ghīyās-al-dīn Tughluq Shāh was a Jainī of the Panjāb, and Ibn Baṭūṭah corroborates it by saying that he was a *Qarauniyyah* Turk, a word which Marco Polo explains as meaning “of mixed breed”, “the offspring of a Turkish father and an Indian mother”.²

The tradition may be held to establish the maternal descent of Ghīyās-al-dīn, but does not explain the origin of the cognomen Tughluq, for Firishṭa’s or Shaikh ‘Ain-al-dīn’s suggestion is obviously a mere guess, and as an essay in philology may be classed with the derivation of Patua from Pathān, or of *Khidīr* from *Khudd* and *dīr*.

Probably the *Mulḥaqāt* of Shaikh ‘Ain-al-dīn Bijāpūrī, which Firishṭa cites (i, 6) as one of his authorities.

² See Thomas, *Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi*, ed. 1871, pp. 186, 187.

I have no doubt that Tughluq is a tribal name, and I believe that Ghiyās-al-dīn's father came of the tribe of Turks now dwelling near Khotan, and called by Sir Anrel Stein, in his *Ruins of Desert Cathay*, "Taghlik." "Tughluq Khān," who served Balban, may have entered his service in the usual manner as an article of merchandise, or may have been expelled from "Black Cathay" by Mughul raids and found an asylum in India. The latter supposition would explain his son's pride in his prowess against the barbarian hordes—"I have encountered the Tatars on twenty-nine occasions and defeated them; hence I am called *al-Malik al-Ghāzī*."¹

The usual transliteration of the word is Tughlaq, Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole prefers Taghlaq,² and Sir Anrel Stein, who does not employ diacritical marks and uses *k* for ق, writes it Taghlik, so that it is only on the question of the vowel sounds that there is any difference. Ibn Baṭūṭah is explicit on this subject, and describes the ت and the ج as being both pointed with *dammah*. He is not an infallible guide in the matter of proper names, for he corrupts İltutmish into Lalmish, but Shams-al-dīn reigned more than a century before Ibn Baṭūṭah's visit to India, and the error may be excused. He is not likely to have been mistaken in respect of the current pronunciation of his patron's tribal name, which he must have heard daily. "Tughluq" seems, therefore, to be the best transliteration to adopt for the dynasty. As Tughluq is a tribal name it is not necessary to describe the second of the line as Muḥammad ibn Tughluq, as is often done. Each ruler of the dynasty is entitled to bear the tribal name as a cognomen.

II. *Rebellion of the Army during the first Expedition to Warangal*

In A.H. 721 (A.D. 1321) Muḥammad Jauna was sent by his father, Ghiyās-al-dīn Tughluq, to conquer the Hindu state of Telingāna, ruled by Pratāparudradeva II of the Kākatiya

¹ Thomas, *Chronicles*, p. 192.

² *Mohammadan Dynasties*, pp. 300, 302.

dynasty, who had his capital at Warangal and had been tributary to 'Alā-al-dīn Muḥammad Khaljī. The prince invaded Telingāna by way of Devagīr, afterwards known as Daulatābād, and, refusing the terms offered by Prātā-parudradeva, who was ready to acknowledge the suzerainty of Ghiyās-al-dīn Tughluq as he had acknowledged that of 'Alā-al-dīn Khaljī, laid siege to Warangal. During the siege there broke out in the army a rebellion of which the official account, that is to say, the account authorized for circulation in the reigns of Muḥammad Tughluq and of his cousin and successor Fīrūz, was that given by the contemporary historian, Ziyā-al-dīn Baranī,¹ who writes (447) as follows:—

“For more than one month posts failed to arrive from the capital, and no orders reached Sultān Muḥammad, who was accustomed to receive two or three orders from his father every week.² Sultān Muḥammad and his intimate associates attached little importance to the failure of the posts, and attributed it to the desertion of some of the garrisons on the road. The news that Sultān Muḥammad attached little importance to this matter spread in the army and the rank and file were oppressed with grave anxiety and much confusion prevailed in each corps of the army. ‘Ubaid, the poet, and the Shaikhzāda of Damascus, two ill-starred, base, turbulent, and lying fellows who had by some means become intimate with Sultān Muḥammad, circulated in the army the lying rumour that Sultān Ghiyās-al-dīn Tughluq had died in the capital, that the affairs of the state were in confusion, that a usurper had ascended the throne, and that communications with Dihlī were cut off; and everybody took his own way.

“This same ill-starred ‘Ubaid and the Shaikhzāda of Damascus, most base, turbulent, ungrateful, and disloyal wretches, gave currency to yet another monstrous lie, and told Malik Tamar, Malik Tigīn, Malik Mul the Afghān, and Malik

¹ References to Baranī are to the *Bibliotheca Indica* text.

² Ibn Baṭūṭah describes in detail the admirable system of posts existing in the empire under the Tughluq dynasty.

Kāfūr, the keeper of the seals, that Sultān Muḥammad, in view of their having held high office at the court of 'Alā-al-dīn Khaljī and of their being the principal officers of the army, regarded them as enemies of the empire, and as being in league one with another and reckoned them unexampled traitors, and had proscribed them. They added that the prince's intention was to seize all four *maliks* in one day and behead them. The *maliks*, who saw these two lying scoundrels at all times and at all places in the prince's company, had no choice but to believe what they said, and having leagued themselves together, withdrew with their contingents from the camp. Their withdrawal threw the whole army into confusion, and a tumult arose. In every corps there was confusion, insomuch that no man would trust his fellow. A mishap to the army of the Muslims was the one thing that the Hindus needed for the saving of their lives, and they now sallied from the fortress, plundered the camp, and returned. Sultān Muḥammad, with his personal followers, took the road to Devagīr, and the army was scattered in every direction. On his way to Devagīr he met with postal runners bringing from the capital mails which informed him of the safety and good health of Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn Tughluq, and the *maliks* of 'Alā-al-dīn Khaljī, who had left the army, quarrelled with one another, and each took his own way, being deserted by his followers, whose arms and horses fell into the hands of the Hindus. Sultān Muḥammad arrived in safety at Devagīr, and there the army reassembled, and Malik Tamar, with a small number of horsemen, fled abroad and hastened into Gondwāna, where he died. The Hindus slew Malik Tigin, the governor of Oudh, and sent his skin to Sultān Muḥammad in Devagīr, and they sent Malik Mul the Afghān, 'Ubaid the poet, and other sedition-mongers bound to Sultān Muḥammad in Devagīr, and Sultān Muḥammad, who had previously arrested their wives and families, sent them all together to his father. Sultān Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn held an open court in the public square of Sīrī and impaled alive 'Ubaid the poet, Kāfūr the

seal-bearer, and the other sedition-mongers, and caused several others, with their wives and families, to be thrown under the feet of the elephants, and on that day, in the public square of *Sirī*, a punishment was inflicted which struck fear and terror into the breasts of all beholders, and at that punishment which *Sulṭān Tughluq Shāh* inflicted, throwing the wives and children of many under the feet of the elephants, the whole city fell a-trembling.”

This account given by *Baranī*, who was in the service of *Muḥammad Tughluq* and of his successor, *Firūz*, is followed substantially by other historians, *Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad*, *Budāonī*, and *Firishta*, some of whom add details, of which the most important is that *Muḥammad* himself returned to *Dihlī* and was presumably present at the execution of the criminals. *Firishta* adds that an epidemic which broke out in the army before *Warangal* contributed to its demoralization. The blame for what occurred is placed primarily on ‘*Ubaid* and the *Shaikhzāda* of *Damascus*, who are represented as double traitors—traitors to their sovereign, *Ghiyās-al-dīn*, and to their master the prince, as well as betrayers of the leading *amīrs* of the army. No motive is suggested for the chain of intrigues in which they engaged, and it is difficult to see what they had to gain by them.

Ibn Baṭūṭah, who visited India during the reign of *Muḥammad Tughluq*, twelve years after this time, tells an entirely different story of the rebellion. His version is as follows :—

“ When *Tughluq* (*Ghiyās-al-dīn*) was firmly established in the capital he sent his son *Muḥammad* to conquer the country of *Tiling*, which is at a distance of three months’ journey from the city of *Dihlī*, and he sent with him a numerous army and with it great *amīrs*, such as *Malik Tamūr*, *Malik Tigīn*, *Malik Kāfūr* the seal-bearer, *Malik Bairam*, and others. When *Muḥammad* reached the country of *Tiling* he resolved to rebel, and he had a companion named ‘*Ubaid*, a theologian and a poet, and he ordered him to spread the report among

the men that the emperor Tughluq was dead, believing that they would readily swear allegiance to him when they heard this. But when this news was proclaimed to the men the *amīrs* contradicted it, and each one caused his drums to be beaten and rose against Muhammad, with whom there remained nobody. The *amīrs* purposed to slay him, but Malik Tamūr prevented them from doing this and stood by him, and Muhammad fled to his father with ten horsemen whom he called his faithful friends, and his father furnished him with treasure and a fresh army, and ordered him to return to Tilig, and he returned thither, and his father learnt what his intention had been and slew the theologian Ubaid, and ordered that Malik Kāfūr, the keeper of the seals, should be impaled, and a lance was thrust through his neck and he was impaled head downwards and his bowels gushed out, and he was left in that position until he died, and the rest of the *amīrs* fled to Sultān Shams-al-dīn [of Bengal], son of Sulṭān Nāsir-al-dīn, son of Sultān Ghāyās-al-dīn Balban."

Thus, according to Ibn Baṭūṭah, it was Muhammad Juma who was the double traitor, and who, having attempted, by means of the army, to seize the throne, subsequently left his agents to his father's vengeance. From Ibn Baṭūṭah's account it would appear that Muhammad, having failed in his attempt to induce the army to acclaim him as emperor, fled at once, reached Dihlī before either his accomplices or his opponents could arrive there, and gave his father his own version of the rebellion in the army, the version, that is to say, subsequently recorded by Baranī. Baranī is not blind to Muhammad Tughluq's faults, but he invariably sets off against them such virtues as he possessed and his undoubted abilities. It would have been impossible for a courtier, writing for publication in the reign of Muhammad's successor, Firūz, who had a tender regard for his cousin's reputation, to portray Muhammad as the despicable traitor of Ibn Baṭūṭah's narrative. Ibn Baṭūṭah, on the other hand, was untrammelled by apprehensions for his personal safety, for he did not write

and publish his account of his travels until his return to his distant western home, where he was far removed from the wrath of the emperor of India; he was under considerable obligations to Muḥammad Tughluq, he was a careful and accurate inquirer and observer, and he had no motive for blackening Muḥammad's character. It is needless to labour this point, for I believe that Ibn Baṭūṭah's version is now generally accepted in preference to Baranī's,¹ but its acceptance creates two difficulties, for it is not easy to understand how Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn could have entrusted to his son the command of a second expedition or how he could afterwards have appointed him regent in Dihlī during his own absence in Bengal.

It appears probable that Muḥammad somehow contrived to keep his father in ignorance of his guilt until he was on his way towards Telingāna with his second army. From Ibn Baṭūṭah's narrative it certainly appears that Muḥammad's guilt was not discovered until he had left Dihlī. Baranī says (449): "And again, after four months, Sultān Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn gave Sultān Muḥammad a large force and appointed him to the command of other armies, and sent him towards Warangal." It is almost incredible the Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn should have remained in ignorance of his son's guilt for four months, and it seems probable that the second army was equipped and dispatched sooner than Baranī says, and had left Dihlī and perhaps reached Devagir by the time four months had elapsed. When Muḥammad Jauna was at the head of his new army his father would naturally have refrained from exasperating him. Muḥammad Jauna's appointment to the regency in his father's absence is not so easily explained. Mr. Thomas ascribes it to infatuation, but infatuation is not usually associated with the character of Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn. We may assume either that Muḥammad Jauna was purged of his former offence by his brilliant conquest of Telingāna, or that Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn believed that he would be less formidable

¹ Mr. Thomas accepted it. See *Chronicles*, p. 108.

at Dihlī, surrounded by *amīrs* and troops devoted to the emperor's interest, than at the head of a quasi-independent army in Telinganā, and accordingly summoned him to the capital. The second supposition appears to be the more probable of the two.

III. *The reason for Sultān Ghiyās-al-dīn's displeasure with his son Muḥammad Jauna during the expedition to Bengal, and the latter's responsibility for his father's death.*

While Muḥammad Jauna was still absent in Telingāna with the second expedition, which terminated more successfully than the first, his father received an appeal for help from Bengal, where the descendants of Ghiyās-al-dīn Balban of Dihlī had been virtually independent sovereigns ever since the feeble reign of Mu'izz-al-dīn Kaiqubād, the last of the Slave dynasty of Dihlī. Shams-al-dīn Firūz, Shāh of Bengal, son of Nāṣir-al-dīn Bughrā Khān, and grandson of Ghiyās-al-dīn Balban, had appointed his son Ghiyās-al-dīn Bahādur governor of Eastern Bengal, or had at least permitted him in 1310 to assume the power of a governor there, and had died in 1318, leaving another son, Shihāb-al-dīn Bughrā, to succeed him on the throne of Bengal. Ghiyās-al-dīn Bahādur, of Eastern Bengal, refused to recognize his brother's authority and in 1319 ousted him and brought the whole of Bengal under his sway, putting to death Qutlū Khān, another of his brothers. Shihāb-al-dīn fled with another brother, Nāṣir-al-dīn, to Dihlī, and there sought aid of Ghiyās-al-dīn Tughluq, who could not resist the temptation to intervene in Bengal, the independence of which had never been recognized by Dihlī. He decided to take command of the expedition to Bengal, and summoned his son Muḥammad from Telingāna to assume the government of the capital during the absence.

There lived at this time in the city of Dihlī the well-known saint Niẓām-al-dīn Auliā, who leaned strongly towards *Ṣūfī*-ism and was suspected of heterodoxy. The historian Niẓām-al-dīn Aḥmad says, in the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, that he

had fallen into disfavour with Ghiyās-al-din Tughluq, but does not mention the cause of the emperor's displeasure, and both Baranī and Budāonī are silent on the subject. Firishṭa likewise fails to mention it in his chronicles of the emperors of Dihlī, but in the life of Nizām-al-dīn Auliya, which is given, with the lives of other saints, at the end of his history, he gives a full and detailed account of the differences between the emperor and the saint.

On ascending the throne after the murder of Quṭb-al-dīn Mubārak Shāh the usurper Nāṣir-al-dīn Khusrav had distributed with a lavish hand the treasure of his predecessor, and, with a view to conciliating the religious element at the capital, had included the *Shaikhs* and holy men among the recipients of his largesse. Some refused to accept anything at his hands, and with the exception of Nizām-al-dīn Auliya those who feared to refuse the money kept it as a deposit, judging that the usurper's reign would not be of long duration and that any responsible sovereign who might be raised to the throne would be sure to demand restitution of public treasure so recklessly expended. Ghiyās-al-dīn Tughluq took the step which they had expected, and rigorously exacted from all recipients of the usurper's misplaced bounty the sums which they had received of him. All other *Shaikhs* at once restored what they had received, but Nizām-al-dīn Auliya, who had spent the money, returned no reply to the emperor's demand. Ghiyās-al-dīn Tughluq, incensed by his contumacy, readily acceded to the request of some of his enemies, and arraigned him before a court of fifty-three doctors of the law on a charge of holding irregular assemblies at which were performed, after the manner of the *Ṣūfīs*, ecstatic songs and dances, held to be unlawful by most Sunnī doctors. The *Shaiikh's* victory in argument stayed the emperor's hand for a time, but can hardly have improved the relations between the two.

Ibn Baṭūṭah says that Muḥammad Jauna was a disciple of Nizām-al-dīn Auliya, and was in the habit of visiting him whenever it was known that he had fallen into one of his

ecstatic trances, in the belief that his utterances when he was in that condition were prophetic. On one occasion the Shaikh, in one of these fits of hysteria, said to Muḥammad, "We give you the kingdom," and it was probably a report of this utterance which still further provoked the wrath of the emperor, for Niẓām-al-dīn Aḥmad relates in the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* that the emperor sent a message to the Shaikh from Bengal to the effect that when he returned he would settle accounts with him. The Shaikh replied in a message which has since become proverbial in India, with application to one who boasts at the beginning of an undertaking. هنوز دہلی

دور است ("Dihlī is yet afar off"), recalling the Scottish proverb, "It's a far cry to Loch Awe." The Shaikh's veiled threat was fulfilled.

According to Ibn Baṭūṭah ¹ the Shaikh himself died before the emperor returned from Bengal, and Muḥammad Jauna helped to bear his bier to the grave. When Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn Tughluq heard of this extravagant mark of respect paid to the corpse of who one had died under the ban of his displeasure his wrath increased, and he wrote a letter to his son threatening to deprive him of the regency and accusing him of other acts which reflected on his loyalty. Various astrologers, instigated doubtless by Muḥammad, prophesied at this time that the emperor should never return to Dihlī, and Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn, who had brought his expedition to a successful conclusion, now hastened back by forced marches, breathing threats of vengeance against the prophets.

Muḥammad Jauna, on hearing of his father's return, prepared a special reception for him. He built, at a distance of some 5 or 6 miles from Tughluqābād, the fortress-city which Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn had founded near Dihlī, a wooden pavilion in which to receive and entertain his father. All

¹ According to other accounts the Shaikh outlived Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn Tughluq by a month or two, and it was only his son's general relations with the Shaikh that displeased him.

historians mention Afghānpūr as the place where this pavilion was built, and Baranī places it as "three or four *kurūh*" and Budāonī at "three *kurūh*" from Dihlī, that is to say, Tughluqābād. There is no village of this name now near Tughluqābād, but I am inclined to believe that the pavilion was built at Aghwanpūr, a village about 5 miles from Tughluqābād. The name of this village may be a corruption of Afghānpūr, or the Muḥammadan historians may have corrupted, as they sometimes do, a Hindī name.

The emperor was received by his son in the pavilion, which fell on him and killed him, and the question is whether the pavilion fell by accident or by design. On this point the evidence of the historians must be heard. Baranī, who could not have ventured, even on the most conclusive evidence, to accuse Muḥammad Tughluq of parricide, writes (452) as follows :—

"When Sultān Muḥammad heard that Sultān Tughluq was returning to the capital, Tughluqābād, by forced marches, he ordered that a small pavilion should be built near Afghānpūr, at a distance of three or four *kurūh* from Tughluqābād, in order that the Sultān might spend the night there and make a state entry into Tughluqābād on the following morning. In Tughluqābād triumphal arches were erected and the drums were beaten when the Sultān Tughluq Shāh arrived and alighted at the new pavilion at the time of the second prayer. Sultān Muḥammad, with the *maliks* and *amīrs* and the principal men, went forth to meet his father and had the honour of kissing his feet. At the time when Sultān Tughluq Shāh had sent for his own special service of food, and the *maliks* and *amīrs* had gone outside to wash their hands, a calamity occurred, like a thunderbolt falling from heaven on the denizens of the earth, and the roof of the dais on which Sultān Tughluq Shāh was sitting fell, and the emperor, with five or six persons, fell beneath the roof, and was united to the neighbourhood of God's mercy."

The translator of the extracts from Baranī in Elliot and

Dowson's *History of India as told by its own Historians*,¹ who has been followed by Lieut.-Col. Ranking in the notes to his translation of vol. i of the *Muntakhab-al-Tawārīkh* of Budāonī,² takes the word "thunderbolt" literally and translates, "A thunderbolt from the sky descended upon the earth, and the roof under which the Sultān was seated fell down, crushing him and five or six other persons, so that they died."

This is a mistranslation. Had Baranī intended to say that the building was actually struck by lightning he would have written *بلاى صاعقه آسمانى* ("the calamity of a thunderbolt from the sky") instead of *صاعقه بلاى آسمانى* ("a thunderbolt

of a calamity from heaven"). The word *صاعقه* is merely a simile, comparing the calamity, in its suddenness, with a thunderbolt, but Baranī would probably have been well content to be misunderstood.

Later historians are less important than Baranī, but as they probably had access to other authorities which are lost to us their statements are worth examining. Nizām-al-dīn Alīmad writes as follows in his *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* :—

"When Ulugh Khān (Muhammad Jauna) heard that his father was returning rapidly he ordered that a pavilion should be built in the space of three days near Afghānpūr, which is three *kurūh* from Tughluqābād, in order that when the Sultān arrived he might alight and pass the night there, that the people of the city might go out to receive him and wait upon him there, and that the next morning, at an auspicious hour, he might enter the city in royal state. When the Sultān arrived at that pavilion there were rejoicings in Tughluqābād, and triumphal arches were erected. Ulugh Khān, with the *maliks*, the *amīrs*, and the principal men of

¹ iii, 235.

² i, 300, n. 3.

the city, went out to receive him, and had the honour of waiting upon him. Sultān Tughluq Shāh sat in that pavilion, and a special table of victuals was brought for him. When the food was removed and the people understood that the Sultān would remount at once they left the building without waiting to wash their hands, and the Sultān remained behind for the purpose of washing his hands. Meanwhile the roof of the building fell, and the Sultān, beneath it, attained to the neighbourhood of God's mercy. The duration of his reign was four years and some months.

"In some histories it is related that as the pavilion was new and freshly built, and they caused the elephants which the Sultān had brought from Bengal to trot around it, the ground around the pavilion and its roof gave way. It will not be concealed from the minds of the discerning that the construction of such a pavilion, for which there was no necessity, casts on Ulugh Khān the suspicion of having compassed his father's death, and it is evident that the author of the *Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī* (Baranī), since he wrote in the reign of Sultān Firūz, who had a great veneration for Sultān Muhammad, may have refrained, out of regard for Firūz, from mentioning this matter. I have, however, constantly heard this assertion made by trustworthy men."

Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad then describes, in corroboration of this story, the threat sent by the emperor to Nizām-al-dīn Auliā and the *Shāikh's* reply.

Budāonī's account is as follows :—¹

"Sultān Tughluq Shāh, taking Bahādūr Shāh (of Bengal) with him, returned to Dihlī victorious and triumphant, and, travelling by double stages, made forced marches. Ulugh Khān (Muhammad Jauna), upon hearing this news, gave immediate orders for the erection of a lofty and noble palace near Afghānpūr, which is at a distance of three *kurūh* from Tughluqābād. It was completed in three days, so

¹ *Bibliotheca Indica* text, i. 224. Lieut.-Col. Ranking's translation, i, 300.

Ulugh Khān and the rest of the *amīrs* were honoured by being enabled to kiss the emperor's hand, and the Sultān, with the concourse which had come out to meet him, sat at meat in that pavilion. When the cloth was removed and men became aware that the emperor was on the point of mounting they came out with unwashed hands, and Ulugh Khān, the hour of whose death had not yet arrived, came out in order to parade before his father the horses, elephants, and other offerings which he had brought out for him. Meanwhile, the roof of the building fell, and the emperor, with five other persons who were beneath it, was received into the neighbourhood of God's mercy.

"It is written in some histories that since the pavilion was freshly built, and new, it collapsed from the shock occasioned by the racing of the elephants, and some historians have written that the construction of such a building, which was in no way necessary, gives rise to the suspicion that Ulugh Khān compassed his father's death, and that Ziyā Baranī, who wrote in the time of the emperor Firūz, who had great reverence for the memory of Sultān Muḥammad, refrained, from fear of Firūz, from recording the whole truth ; but it will be evident to all men of discernment that this story is most unreasonable, for Ulugh Khān was sitting with his father at meat, and whence can he have had the power to work this miracle, that the building should fall at the moment when he left it ? The most ingenious story of all is that of Ṣadr-i-Jahān Gujārātī, who has written in his history that Ulugh Khān erected this building by means of a talisman, so that when the talisman was broken the roof fell. Hājī Muḥammad Qandahārī has written in his history that at the moment when the Sultān was engaged in washing his hands a thunderbolt fell from the sky and split the roof asunder, so that it fell on his head, and this account, according to the estimate of what is likely to have happened, seems to be the most probable ; but God knows the truth of the matter."

Minor discrepancies between these accounts need not be

noticed. Firishṭa's reference to "some historians" is evidently a covert attack on Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad, for Firishṭa was addicted to biting the hand which fed him. Ḥājī Muḥammad Qandahārī's account was probably based on the misunderstanding of Baranī, which has already been noticed. Firishṭa's defence of Muḥammad Jauna is ingenious and plausible, but it is demolished by Ibn Baṭūṭah, who had the story from eye-witnesses. He says that the building, which was mostly of wood, stood high above the ground on a substructure of wood, and was built under the general supervision of "the well-known Malikzāda" and the immediate superintendence of Aḥmad ibn Ayyāz, afterwards entitled Khvāja Jahān, who was at that time supervisor of buildings, and was probably an architect by profession. Ibn Baṭūṭah writes: "The art in the construction of this building was that they contrived it in such a manner that when the elephants passed by on one side of it the pavilion fell"; he does not enter into details of the device by which the fall of the building was ensured, but from his account it appears to be likely that Ṣadr-i-Jahān's "talisman" was a beam left projecting from the substructure, which, when dislodged by an elephant, brought the building down. Ibn Baṭūṭah continues his account as follows:—

"The emperor alighted at the pavilion and his retinue was feasted there, and they dispersed. Muḥammad asked his father's permission to have the elephants paraded in full array before him, and the emperor assented. Shaiḫ Rukn-al-dīn told me that he was there with the emperor, and with the two of them was the emperor's favourite son, Maḥmūd. Muḥammad, the emperor's son, came and said to the Shaiḫ, "Aḥlund, it is now evening. Come down and retire." The Shaiḫ told me that he descended, and the elephants were brought up on one side [of the pavilion] as had been arranged, and when they came against the pavilion it fell on the emperor and his son Maḥmūd. The Shaiḫ told me that he heard the tumult and returned, and when he arrived

he found that the pavilion had fallen on the emperor. The prince ordered that axes and spades should be brought in order to dig him out, and they brought them to him at sunset, and they dug. The emperor was stretched over his son [Mahmūd] as though to protect him from death. Some said that the emperor was dead when he was taken out, but others said that he was alive. His son [Muhammad] made preparations for his funeral, and carried him by night to the tomb which he had built for himself without the city of Tughluqābād, which had been called after his name, and there he buried him. . . .

"On account of the art which the *amīr* Khyāja Jahān [Ahmad ibn Ayyāz] had displayed in building the pavilion which fell upon Tughluq, he enjoyed much favour at the hands of Tughluq's son, and was advanced to the highest rank."

Ibn Batūṭah's impartial evidence is conclusive. His informant was one who had been present on the occasion, and for whose personal safety Muhammad Janna had shown solicitude. It was Muhammad Janna who suggested the parade of the elephants, by means of which the catastrophe was brought about, and the sudden promotion of Ahmad ibn Ayyāz, who appears in Baranī's list of the officials of Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn Tughluq as a simple inspector of buildings, to be minister of the empire on Muhammad's accession completes the chain of evidence.

IV. *Chronology of the Reign of Muhammad Tughluq*

The chronology of this reign is full of difficulties. The contemporary historian, Ziyā-al-dīn Baranī, a most valuable authority for details of the life and character of his master, of his measures, and of many events in his reign, fails conspicuously as a methodical chronicler. Events are not invariably recorded in their chronological order, and as dates are seldom assigned to them it is impossible to evolve order out of the chaos. Those who have followed him have

used him as their chief authority, and Nizām-al-dīn Ahmad, in his *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, has imitated him so faithfully that for this reign of twenty-six years he gives only two dates, one of which is that of the emperor's death. As a source of information on chronological questions the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* may be neglected.

Firishta also bases his account on that of Baranī, but is less niggardly of dates. Baranī's *Tārīkh-i-Firūz Shāhī* is the only authority, besides general histories, cited by him for this reign, and the source of his chronological information cannot be ascertained. He gives us, which no other author does, the month (*Rabī'al-awwal*, 725 = Feb.-March, 1325), but not the day of the death of Ghiyās-al-dīn Tughluq and the accession of his son Muḥammad, and besides this gives us nine dates, including that of Muḥammad's death. One or two others may be supplied from his account of the rebellion in the Dakan and the foundation of the Bahmanī kingdom.

Abd-al-Qādir Budāonī cites no authorities, except the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* of his friend Nizām-al-dīn Ahmad and the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī*, but gives us no fewer than sixteen dates, including those of Muḥammad's accession and death, and attempts to marshal events in their chronological order, but has not been entirely successful.

own experience vouches. Then follows a list of his personal experiences, and lastly an account of the journey of his mission across India after he had left Delhi. This account supplies us with most valuable information regarding the terrible condition to which the country had been reduced by Muhammad's tyranny and misrule.

Ibn Baṭūṭah arrived in the Indus on September 12, 1333, and reached Delhi about the end of that year or the beginning of 1334, and except for a journey to Lāhor and two journeys in the Dnāb, one of which included a pilgrimage into Oudh, to the shrine of Sālār Mas'ūd at Balrāich, remained at the capital until July 22, 1342, when he left the city as head of a mission which Muhammad sent to China. When, therefore, he mentions, as he often does, any event of which he was an eye-witness, it is certain that it occurred between those two dates, and the order in which he mentions events often enables us to date them more accurately.

Two dates for events in the reign are given in chronograms by the court poet, Badr-al-dīn of Chāh, usually known as Badr-i-Chāhī or Badr-i-Chāh, and other dates are satisfactorily determined by legends on coins.

The first date to be ascertained is that of the death of Ghiyās-al-dīn Tughluq and the accession of Muhammad. Firishṭa alone gives the month of his death. Rabī'-al-awwal, A.H. 725, which began on February 15, 1325. Muhammad died on Muḥarram 21, 752, and Niẓām-al-dīn Aḥmad, Budāonī, and Firishṭa concur in giving the duration of his reign as twenty-seven years, without the addition of any months or days, regarding which Firishṭa is usually particular. This calculation places Muhammad's accession on Muḥarram 21, 725, but it appears that Firishṭa, being in this case not quite sure of his dates, took no account of the forty odd days by which Muhammad's reign fell short of twenty-seven years. His accession may be placed in February, 1325.

In the same year (A.H. 725 = A.D. 1325) Muhammad

restored Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn Bahādur, whom his father had brought to Dihlī as a prisoner, to the government of Eastern Bengal, as a vassal under the tutelage of Tātār Khān, now entitled Bahrām Khān, whom Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn Tughluq had left in that province as governor.

One of Muḥammad's earliest acts was to order the compilation of a register of the land revenue of the empire on the model of the register already maintained in the districts near the capital. The order was probably issued in A.H. 725, but as registers were compiled, according to Baranī, for the provinces of Dihlī, Gujarāt, Mālwa, Devagīr, Telingāna, Kamplī, Dhorasamudra (Dvāravatipūra), Ma'bar, Tirhut, Lakhnāwatī, Satgānw, and Sonārgānw,¹ the work cannot have been completed until A.H. 726 (A.D. 1326). In the same year, Sultān Nāṣir-al-dīn having died in Western Bengal, Qadr Khān was appointed governor of that province.

Budāonī correctly places the rebellion of Malik Bahā-al-dīn Gurshāsp in A.H. 727 (A.D. 1327), but errs in saying that it occurred in Dihlī. Bahā-al-dīn Gurshāsp was the son of the sister of Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn Tughluq, and therefore first cousin of Muḥammad. His fief was Sāgar, about 7 miles north of Shorāpūr, in the Dukan, and he had great influence in that country. Ibn Baṭūṭah says that on his uncle's death he refused to recognize his cousin's authority and Firūz says that his rebellion assumed serious dimensions, and spred

Muḥammad of the necessity of a more central position than Dīhlī for the capital of an empire which included the Dakan and the Peninsula, for in this year he made Devagīr his capital, renaming it Daulatābād. The earliest coins struck at Devagīr under its title of قبة الاسلام were struck at this time. Some confusion has arisen in connexion with the date of this event, owing to historians having confounded two distinct measures taken by Muḥammad. The first of these was the transfer of the capital from Dīhlī to Daulatābād. On this occasion the great officers of state, as well as minor officials connected with the central administration, were compelled to transport their families from Dīhlī, to build houses for them at Daulatābād, and to make that city their home, but it was not until two years later that Muḥammad drove all the inhabitants of Dīhlī, *en masse*, across India to Daulatābād, and this was less an administrative than a punitive measure.

Khyājā Jahān was sent to compel the rāja of Kamplī to surrender the fugitive Gurshāsp, and the rāja, driven to extremities, sent Gurshāsp with a recommendation to Vīra Ballāla III, rāja of Dvāravatipura, and performed the rite of *jauhar*. His eleven sons were captured, with other inhabitants of Kamplī, and were forced to accept Islām.

Vīra Ballāla III was made of less stern stuff than the rāja and surrendered Gurshāsp who was sent to Daulatābād. Portions of his flesh, cooked with rice, were served up as food to his family, and the rest was thrown before the elephants. His skin, stuffed with straw, was exhibited in the various provinces of the empire, as an example to the disobedient, but when it reached Multān the governor, Malik Bahrām Aiba, Kishlū Khān, instead of sending it on, caused it to be buried.

The country between Daulatābād and the sea was still in the hands of the Hindūs, and towards the end of the year Khyājā Jahān was sent against the fortress of Kondhāna,

now Sinhgargh, held by the Kolī, Nāga Nāik. As the gallant Kolī held out for eight months the fall of Kondhāna must be placed in 728 (A.D. 1327-8).

In the same year Malik Bahrām Aiba, Kishlū Khān, rebelled in Multān. Two causes are assigned for his rebellion. Ibn Baṭūṭah says that he had seriously displeased the emperor by interring the stuffed skin of the unfortunate Gurshāsp,¹ and that he rebelled in anticipation of being attacked. Baranī suggests, though he does not assert, that the rebellion was due to the emperor's exorbitant demands. Firishṭa says that Kishlū Khān was included in the order directing all the great *amīrs* to send their wives and families to Danlatābād, and that an officer sent to Multān to see that he obeyed the order behaved so insolently that he was slain. Budāonī corroborates Firishṭa.

Muḥammad marched from Danlatābād to Multān by way of Dihlī, and defeated and slew Kishlū Khān. The details of the battle are given by Ibn Baṭūṭah, who six years later saw Kishlū Khān's head, or skull, hanging over the house which he had formerly occupied. Muḥammad was only restrained from ordering a general massacre of the inhabitants of Multān by the saint Rukn-al-dīn. Ibn Baṭūṭah says that Muḥammad, while he was at Multān, sent Khvāja Jahān to suppress a revolt in Kamālpūr, "on the sea coast."

From Multān Muḥammad was recalled to Dihlī by disturbances in the Gangetic Dīnāb. In A.H. 729 (A.D. 1328-9) Tarmāshīrīn the Mughul, who from Firishṭa's description of him appears to have been 'Alā-al-dīn Tarmāshīrīn, the Chaghataī ruler of Transoxiana, invaded India. Firishṭa wrongly places this invasion in A.H. 727, and were it not for the position which he gives to the invasion in the sequence of events I should be inclined to believe that his text has

¹ Ibn Baṭūṭah says that the stuffed skin of Ghiyās-al-dīn Bahādur accompanied that of Gurshāsp, but this is a mistake, for Bahādur did not rebel until A.H. 731 (A.D. 1330-1). Ibn Baṭūṭah had not yet arrived in India and wrote his account of this event from hearsay.

suffered from a very common error of the scribes, the substitution of سبع for تبع, but as he places the invasion among the earliest events of the reign I believe that he himself has been misled by this error in one of his authorities. Historians differ as to the means by which Muhammad rid himself of the invader, but, whether he bought him off or drove him out of the country, the invasion was no more than a raid, and Tarmāshīrīn disappeared as suddenly as he had come.

Muhammad now remained in Dihlī for two years. He was incensed both with the inhabitants of the Dūāb and the citizens of Dihlī. The former, always turbulent and stiff-necked, were now accused, absurdly enough as it would appear, of having invited the Mughul to the country. Muhammad could hardly have condemned himself more completely than by alleging that his subjects preferred a Mughul raid to his rule.

The citizens of Dihlī were thoroughly disaffected, probably owing to the transfer of the capital, and, as a rising of shopkeepers against an army was out of the question, their indignation found a vent in anonymous letters, filled with abuse and curses, which they contrived to introduce into the palace and council-chamber of the emperor. Muhammad avenged himself by driving the whole of the population of the city to Daulatābād, nearly 700 miles distant. Ibn Baṭūṭah was told that as the emperor looked at night, from the roof of his palace, over the desolate city and saw neither fire, smoke, nor lamp, he said: "Now is my heart rejoiced and my spirit appeased."

During the following year Muhammad, still at Dihlī, introduced two of his most disastrous measures—the enhancement of the assessment of the land in the Dūāb and the issue of his fictitious brass currency, which was an attempt to make brass tokens pass current as silver coins. The enhancement of the assessment was intended to be both a punitive measure and a means of replenishing the treasury, and failed of both its objects. Its extent was such as to deprive

the cultivators of their livelihood, and they left their holdings, burnt their crops, and took to brigandage. The effect of the introduction of the fictitious currency, which cannot be discussed in detail within the limits of this paper, were ruinous.

Meanwhile the *amīrs* and officials in attendance on the emperor were growing restive. At his command they had transferred their wives and families to Daulatābād, and he had now remained absent from the new capital for two years. Towards the end of the year, therefore, he returned to Daulatābād.

In the following year (A.H. 731 = A.D. 1330-1) Ghiyās-al-dīn Bahādur rebelled in Sonārgānw. The rebellion was crushed and the rebel slain by Bahrām Khān, who remained in Eastern Bengal as sole governor.

A.H. 732 (A.D. 1331-2) was comparatively uneventful, but matters were going from bad to worse.

Muhammad cherished fantastic visions of extending his sway over Transoxiana and Persia, and with a view to their future realization encouraged prominent natives of those countries, by means of lavish gifts, to make India their home. It was probably in this year that Amir Naurūz, son-in-law of Tarmāshīrīn, and many other Mughuls came to India.

By A.H. 733 (A.D. 1332-3) the effects of the disastrous policy pursued in the Gangetic Dūāb, where a rural population had been converted into brigands and rebels, recalled the emperor from Daulatābād to Dhili. No attempt was made to remedy the mistake already made. The province was treated as a hostile country. Muhammad led a punitive expedition to Baran, now Bulandshahr, and from this centre pillaged the surrounding country, destroyed such crops as had been grown, and massacred the inhabitants, rows of whose heads soon garnished the city wall. From Baran he went on to Kanauj and Dalmau, which fared no better than Baran.

In A.H. 734 (A.D. 1333-4) Muhammad was still in the

Kanauj and Dalmā districts, and on Muharram 1 of this year (Sept. 12, 1333) Ibn Batūṭah arrived at the mouth of the Indus and reached Dihlī either at the end of 1333 or early in 1334. He found ‘Ināḍ-al-Mulk Sartiz governor of the province of Sind and Multān and Qutb-al-Mulk governor of the city of Multān. Muhammad did not return to Dihlī until June 8, 1334, and on his return was received as a conqueror.

Meanwhile Sayyid Jalāl-al-dīn Aḥsan of Kaithal, who had been appointed governor of Maḥar and had his headquarters at Madura, had risen in rebellion, and Muḥammad after resting for seven months in Dihlī set out with the object of reducing the rebel. Baranī assigns no date to this rebellion, and errs in placing it, in point of time, after the rebellion of Fakhr-al-dīn Mubārak Shāh in Eastern Bengal, which occurred in A.H. 739 (A.D. 1338-9). This error has probably misled both Firishṭa and Budāunī, who assign A.H. 742 (A.D. 1341-2) as the date of this rebellion, but it does not excuse their describing Sayyid Aḥsan as Sayyid Ḥasan, and still less does it excuse Budāunī's error in confounding him with ‘Alā-al-dīn Ḥasan Khān, who some years later ascended the throne of the Dakan under the title of Bahman Shāh, and who was certainly not a Sayyid. Baranī, in another passage, corrects his error by saying that Muḥammad Tughluq was still in the Kanauj and Dalmā districts when he heard of the rebellion in Madura, and Ibn Batūṭah, who is corroborated by legends on coins, indulges us, on this occasion, with a date. He says that Muḥammad, having returned from the Dūāb to Dihlī on June 8, 1334, left the city again on Jamādī-al-awwal 9, A.H. 735 (Jan. 5, 1335), in order to suppress the rebellion in Maḥar, and his authority should carry some weight, for he was the rebel's son-in-law. The latest date on coins struck in Madura in the name of Muḥammad Tughluq is A.H. 734, and the earliest coins struck there in the name of Jalāl-al-dīn Aḥsan Shāh bear the date A.H. 735,¹ so that it was in that year

¹ One coin is said to bear the date 734, but this is doubtful. See *JASB.* pt. i, lxiv, 49, and *JRAS.* 1909, p. 667.

that Ahsan Shāh proclaimed his independence, and as he was killed in A.H. 740 it is clear that Muhammad Tughluq cannot have marched against him in A.H. 742.

Muhammad marched from Dhilī to Daulatābād, where he levied large contributions and permanently enhanced the assessment on the land in the Marāṭha country. Having sent Khvāja Jahān, the minister, back to Dhilī, he advanced, at the end of 735 or early in 736, into Telingāna, on his way to Madura.

A rebellion now broke out in Lāhor, and the minister, Khvāja Jahān, marched from Dhilī to crush it. Both Firishta and Budāonī place this rebellion in A.H. 743, the year following that in which they place the emperor's departure from Dhilī for the south. It occurred in the year following his departure from Dhilī, but in 736, not in 743. Baranī, who probably accompanied the emperor, mentions this rebellion very briefly. He says (481), "Ahmad-i-Ayyāz (Khvāja Jahān) came to Dhilī and a rebellion broke out in Lāhor, and that rebellion, too, was suppressed by Ahmad-i-Ayyāz." Budāonī not only misdates the rebellion, but gives an entirely wrong account of it. He says: "And in the year 743 they treacherously slew Malik Hūlājūn, Gul Chandar the Khokhar, and Malik Tatār the Less, governor of Lāhor, and when Khvāja Jahān was sent against them they came forth to meet him, and the rebels were thoroughly punished and defeated." Firishta's account is less incorrect, but is incomplete. He says: "And in the year 743 Malik Chandar, chief of the Khokars (Khokhars), raised the standard of opposition and slew Tātār Khān. The Sultān sent Khvāja Jahān to suppress him, and he utterly defeated the Khokars."

Ibn Baṭūṭah, who accompanied Khvāja Jahān on his expedition to Lāhor, is our best authority for the details of this rebellion, and his account is the fullest which we have. He says: "After the emperor had reached Daulatābād the *amīr* Hūlājūn rose in rebellion in the city of Lāhor and assumed the royal title, and the *amīr* Quljand abetted him

in his rebellion and was made his minister. . This news reached the minister, Khwāja Jahān, who was in Dihlī, and he assembled the troops and collected the army and assembled all the Khurāsānīs and all the emperor's servants who were in Dihlī, and took all his companions, including me, as I was in Dihlī. . . . Hulājūn came to the attack with his army, and the meeting of the two armies took place on the bank of one of the great rivers, and Hulājūn was defeated and fled, and large numbers of his men were drowned in the river."

Hulājūn is the Arabicized version of the Mughul name Hulāgū, and this *amīr* was evidently one of the Mughuls whom Muhammad Tughluq had encouraged to enter his service. In "*amīr Quljand*" we can recognize Gul Chandar, chief of the Khokhars.

This account, given by an eye-witness, completely disposes of Budāonī and Firishṭa. Hulāgū and Gul Chandar were the leaders of the rebels, not their victims, and Gul Chandar was not the prime mover in the rebellion, but an abettor and subordinate of Hulāgū. Budāonī is also mistaken in his description of the unfortunate governor of Lāhor who was slain by the rebels. He is not Tātār Khān the younger, who is always described as the adopted son of Ghiyās-al-dīn Tughluq, and was now governor of Eastern Bengal, with the title of Bahram Khān, but Tātār Khān the elder.

Meanwhile Muhammad was continuing his march through Telingāna and had reached Warangal,¹ when a pestilence, probably cholera, broke out in his army, and slew large numbers of all ranks, from *amīrs* to camp followers. Muhammad himself was smitten, and the army could proceed no further. Leaving Malik Qabūl in Warangal as governor of southern Telingāna, he began, as soon as he was able to travel, to retrace his steps. Shihāb-al-dīn received the title of Nuṣrat Khān and was left in Bīdar as governor of northern Telingāna, or rather as farmer of the revenue, for he agreed to pay to the

¹ Ibn Baṭūṭah says Badarkot (Bīdar), but here the authority of Baranī is to be preferred.

treasury the annual sum of ten million *tangas*. Muḥammad continued in his retreat, and at Bīr suffered from a severe toothache. The tooth was extracted and buried, and Muḥammad's vanity caused to be erected over it a domed tomb, known as "the dome of the tooth", which is still standing.

In the meantime reports had reached Daulatābād that the emperor had succumbed to the pestilence and Malik Hūshang, an *amīr*, whom he seems to have regarded with peculiar affection had rebelled in Daulatābād, but on learning that Muḥammad was still alive and was returning, fled from Daulatābād and took refuge with a Hindū chieftain in the Western Ghāṭs, who refused to surrender him. Muḥammad remained for some time in Daulatābād to recover his health, and having appointed his former tutor, Qutluḡh Khān, governor of the province, with instructions to deal with the rebel Hūshang, set out for Dihlī. Before his departure he gave permission to all natives of Dihli to return with him, and many accompanied him, but some had become attached to their new home and remained in the Dakan. He reached Dihlī in July, 1337.

As he passed through Mālwa the famine was sore in the land, and Dihlī was in no better case. The seven lean years, during which parents ate their children and the hides of animals were sold as human food, had begun. From the ruined Dūāb, where cultivation had been well-nigh extinguished, there was no relief, but there was corn in Oudh, which had prospered under the rule of ‘Ain-al-Mulk, and the emperor led his people forth from the city to the banks of the Ganges. Here, in the autumn of 1337, he founded on the site of the ancient city of Khor,¹ about 165 miles from Dihlī, a city of booths, to which he gave the name of Sargadwārī, “the gate of heaven.” Here the people were fed from the full granaries of Oudh, the contents of which were brought to the vast

¹ Khor was situated in 27° 33' N. and 79° 35' E., about 6 miles to the east of Shamsābād. Sargadwāri was the ¹rit ~~Sargadwāri~~.

camp by 'Ain-al-Mulk, and in the following year the booths were replaced by more permanent dwellings.

During Muḥammad's absence reports of his death had reached Dihlī as well as Daulatābād, and his favourite, Sayyid Ibrāhīm the Purse-bearer, son of Sayyid Jalāl-al-dīn Aḥsan, had been guilty of a treasonable act in his government of Sarsuti and Hānsī. Ziyā-al-Mulk was escorting the annual remittance of treasure from Sind to Dihlī and Sayyid Ibrāhīm had detained him in Hānsī on the pretext that the roads were unsafe, but with the object of seizing the treasure and proclaiming his independence as soon as the news of the emperor's death should be confirmed. When the report was discovered to be false, Ziyā-al-Mulk had been allowed to go his way, and no great harm had been done, but Ibrāhīm's design gradually transpired and some little time after the emperor's return from the Dakan he was put to death.

Nuṣrat Khān now rebelled in Bīdar, probably because he found himself unable to pay the promised contribution to the treasury, and the rebellion was crushed by Qutluḡh Khān, who was sent against him from Daulatābād. Nuṣrat Khān, strange to say, was pardoned.

Muḥammad's disastrous attempt to conquer Tibet by the dispatch of 80,000, or, according to other accounts, 100,000 horse into the Himālaya is placed, both by Budāonī and Firishṭa, in the following year, A.H. 738 (A.D. 1337-8), and as neither Baranī nor Ibn Baṭūṭah, who both mention the expedition, assigns a date to it we have no ground for questioning the statements of the two first historians. On the other hand, they receive some corroboration from the poet Badr-i-Chāch, who has an ode commemorating the capture, in this year, of the fortress of Nagarkoṭ (Kāngra), which was doubtless part of the larger enterprise. The army sent into the Himālaya was practically annihilated, and no more than ten men returned in the following year.

In A.H. 739 (A.D. 1338-9) Muḥammad Tughluq was still at Sargadwārī, and in this year, according to Budāonī, Bahrām

Khān, the governor of Eastern Bengal died, and Fakhr-al-dīn, one of his officers, assumed independence and proclaimed himself king under the title of Fakhr-al-dīn Mubārak Shāh. Mr Thomas was inclined to believe, on the authority of a coin on which he read the date as 737, that this event must be placed two years earlier, but there appears to be no reason to doubt the correctness of Budāonī's date. The date on the coin is on its margin, in Arabic words, not figures, and from Mr. Thomas's illustration it appears to me that the common mistake of confounding سبع with تسع has been made.

Fakhr-al-dīn attacked Qadr Khān, Muḥammad's governor of Sakhnāwatī, but was repulsed. In the following year (A.H. 740 = A.D. 1339-40) he returned to Lakhnāwatī, slew Qadr Khān, and made himself master of the whole of Bengal. Budāonī's statement that Muḥammad Tughluq marched against him in 741, captured him, brought him to Lakhnāwatī, and put him to death, is entirely incorrect. Muḥammad was too much occupied, even had he not been crippled by the disaster in the Himālaya, to send an expedition into Bengal, which was lost to the empire, and Fakhr-al-dīn Mubārak reigned there for the next ten years.

In this year (740) 'Alī Shāh rebelled in the Dakan. He is described by Ibn Baṭūṭah as 'Alī Shāh Kar ("the Deaf") by Budāonī, wrongly, as 'Alī Shīr, and by Baranī as 'Alī Shāh, sister's son of Zafar Khān, and one of Qutluḡ Khān's centurions in the Dakan. Budāonī is again astray in his chronology. He places this rebellion in A.H. 746, but admits that it happened while the emperor was at Sargadwārī, which he left in A.H. 740, or at the latest, early in A.H. 741. The question is settled by Ibn Baṭūṭah's mention of the rebellion. He finally left the court of Muḥammad Tughluq on Ṣafar 17, 743 (July 22, 1342), so that the rebellion certainly occurred before that date.

'Alī Shāh had been sent by Qutluḡ Khān to collect the revenue from Gulbarga, rebelled there, slew Bhairon, the

He then entered the town, seized a force, and marched to Fīrūz where he slew the governor and occupied the town. Qutūb al-Kāh was sent against him and defeated him, and 'Alī Shāh committed suicide.

In the same year 'Ain-al-Mulk, governor of Oudh, rose in rebellion. Bahā'u-d-dīn's chronology is again at fault. He places this rebellion in a.h. 747, and Fīrūzī, apparently, places it in a.h. 745. Both dates are too late by some years. Ibn Batūṭah, who was with the emperor in Sargadwārī and accompanied him in his operations against the rebels and in his subsequent pilgrimages to Bahrāīn, of both of which he gives a detailed account, left the imperial court, as has been said, early in a.h. 743. It is certain that the rebellion occurred before the emperor's return to Dīhli in a.h. 749.

The circumstances of the rebellion are briefly as follows: The emperor proposed to transfer 'Ain-al-Mulk, who had held the government of Oudh for many years and had done excellent service in supplying Sargadwārī with food, to the Dekan. 'Ain-al-Mulk was unwilling to leave Oudh, and suspected the emperor of a desire to ruin him. At this time several fraudulent officials fleeing from justice took refuge in Oudh and 'Ain-al-Mulk who was loth to surrender them but feared the emperor's wrath, rose in rebellion. Fortune at first favoured him, for he was enabled to seize all the elephants, horses, and baggage animals of the imperial camp, which had their pasture on his side of the river, and Mu'ammad, whose army was disorganized by the loss of the animals, and who suspected the loyalty of his *amīrs*, marched with all speed on Kanauj, seeking the protection of its walls. The rebels marched, on the opposite bank of the river, in the same direction and crossed the river near Kanauj, where a battle was fought, in which they were defeated and 'Ain-al-Mulk was captured. 'Ain-al-Mulk was kept in confinement and was treated with great severity until after the emperor's return to Dīhli, when, in 741, he was released and pardoned in consideration of his former good service. 'Alī Shāh was

brought from the Dakan at the same time, and was banished to Ghazni, but returning afterwards to India was captured and executed.

After the suppression of 'Ain al-Mulk's rebellion Muhammad Tughluq made a pilgrimage to the shrine of the martyr, Sālār Mas'ūd, in Bahraich, and thence returned to Delhi.

It was at this time that Muhammad Tughluq was tormented by doubts regarding the legality of his sovereignty, which had never been recognized by a Caliph, or sovereign pontiff of Islam, but the difficulty was to find the Caliph. The 'Abbāsid Caliphs of Baghdād, long puppets in the hands of foreign *maîtres du palais* and bodyguards, had been finally extinguished by the Mughuls in A.D. 1258. After diligent inquiries from travellers and foreigners Muhammad learnt of the existence in Egypt of a phantom, who styled himself al-Mustakfi billāh, and was descended from the brother of the last 'Abbāsid Caliph in Baghdād. He sent him a humble petition, seeking his recognition and at once substituted his name for his own on the coins of the empire, but when the first coins were struck at Dihli in the name of al-Mustakfi the phantom Caliph was dead, and had been succeeded by another shadow, al-Wāthiq I (of Egypt), and he by another, al-Hākim II (of Egypt).

Muhammad Tughluq had been too precipitate. A little patience would have enabled him to maintain at his court, as the Mamlūks of Egypt did later, a submissive "supreme pontiff" of his own, for in this year there came to Dihli from Transoxiana, where he had been living under the protection of the Mughul Khān, 'Alā-al-dīn Tarmāshūrīn, Ghīyās-al-dīn Muḥammad, son of 'Abd-al-Qādir, son of Yūsuf, son of 'Abd-al-'Azīz, son of the Caliph al-Mustanshir the 'Abbāsi (A.H. 1226-42) of Baghdād. His descent having been verified, he was received with extravagant honours and became a pensioner on Muhammad's boundless liberality. Besides enormous gifts in money, he received as a residence and private estate, almost as a petty principality, Sirī, the city

of 'Ala-al-dīn Khaljī, and one of the four cities (Dihlī, Sirī, Tughluqābād, and Jahānpanāh) of which the capital was then composed. He was but a well-born beggar. Ibn Baṭūṭah, who had dealings with him, found him both mean and dishonest. He was known at court as *Makhdūmzāda* ("descendant of our lord").

In Dihlī Muḥammad received news of the rebellion of Shāhū Lodī the Afghān, who had slain Bihzād, the governor of Multān, and had seized that city and province. He marched from Dihlī to suppress it, and had left the city only a few stages behind him when he received news of the death of his mother, which deeply affected him. On reaching Dīpālpūr he received a petition from Shāhū, imploring his forgiveness, and learnt that Shāhū and all his followers had fled into Afghānistān. He returned to Dihlī by way of Sunām and Agroha, reaching the city in A.H. 742 (A.D. 1341-2), when the inhabitants were reduced to such straits by the famine that they were eating human flesh.

Budāoni does not mention Shāhū's rebellion in its proper place in the sequence of events and assigns no date to it. Firishṭa errs in placing it immediately after Muḥammad's return from Daulatābād and before the foundation of Sargadwārī. It occurred after his return from Sargadwārī to Dihlī.

Muḥammad remained at Dihlī throughout the year 743. He appointed Ibn Baṭūṭah his envoy to China, and dispatched him from Dihlī on Ṣafar 17 (July 22, 1342). Ibn Baṭūṭah's account of his journey, and its vicissitudes discloses to us the deplorable condition of the country. Hindūstān proper, the Gangetic Dūāh, and the country to the west of the Jauna, were seething with revolt, and the Muḥammadan governors were not safe even in their fortresses.

It seems to have been in the following year (A.H. 744) that the emperor led an expedition into the districts of Sunām, Sāmāna, Kaithal, and Guhrām, where various tribes of Hindūs had abandoned their villages and fields and retired, under the leadership of their chiefs, to encampments of

booths in the jungles, where they lived on the proceeds of brigandage and highway robbery. These large gangs of brigands were dispersed, their encampments destroyed, and their chiefs captured and brought to Delhi, where some were converted to Islām, and many were made *amīrs*.

In this year Hājī Saʿīd al-Ṣarṣarī arrived as envoy from al-Hākim II, the 'Abbāsid Caliph in Egypt, and was accorded a magnificent reception. The emperor humbled himself before him and received with extravagant demonstrations of respect the robe of honour and the decree conferring on him the title of *Nāṣir Amīr-al-Mu'minīn*. The celebration of the great festivals and the Friday prayers, which had been suspended until the emperor's sovereignty was confirmed by pontifical recognition, was resumed with great pomp and splendour, and the formal Friday sermon was revised, the names of such of Muḥammad's predecessors on the throne of Delhi as had not received the recognition of one of the 'Abbāsid Caliphs being omitted from it. Every utterance of Hājī Saʿīd was received as a pontifical decree, and as Baranī, no unfriendly witness, writes: "He would not take a drink of water but in accordance with the Caliph's decree." Hājī Rajab Burqaʿī was sent to Egypt with an enormous quantity of treasure and many rich gifts for al-Hākim II.

The date (A.H. 745) assigned by Budāonī and Firishṭa to a rebellion in Kara may be accepted as correct. The rebel Nizām-al-Mulk, was a low-born adventurer, a sweepstake according to Firishṭa, who, finding himself unable to get the large sum for which he had taken the district to rise in rebellion and styled himself Sultan. Muhammad Tughlaq was preparing to march against him when Shahr Allāh, brother of al-Hākim II, ruler of Oudh, attacked and captured Nizām-al-Mulk, and sent his head to Delhi. Nizām-al-Mulk's rebellion was the first of the emperors, was a great disaster to the empire, and the embers of rebellion were kindled.

Early in the year 1344 A.D.

angered by the continuous decline in the revenue receipts in the Dakan, which had fallen, according to Baranī (501), "from crores and lakhs to thousands." Backbiters and place-seekers attributed the deficit to the dishonesty of the collectors appointed by Qutluḡh Khān. The emperor resolved to recall Qutluḡh Khān from Daulatābād and fixed the revenue demand for the Marāṭha country, according to Baranī, at sixty-seven crores (670,000,000) of silver *tangas*. Firishta gives the sum as 70,000,000 *tangas*, which appears to be more reasonable. Ibn Baṭūṭah, who lodged at Daulatābād on his way to the coast, says that the revenue was 170,000,000 *dīnārs*.

The poet Badr-i-Chāch left Dihlī on Sha'ban 1 of this year (December 8, 1344) charged with the duty of recalling Qutluḡh Khān from the government of Daulatābād. The pill was gilded for the emperor's faithful old tutor and servant, and the reason given by the poet for his recall was that he might gladden his eyes with a sight of the decree of the true Caliph, Aḥmad the Imām, Abūl 'Abbās, "the sun of the earth and the shadow of God."

Qutluḡh Khān was replaced by his brother, Maulānā Nizām-al-dīn, 'Ālim-al-Mulk, from Bahroch, a mild and simple man to whom little real power was entrusted, for the Marāṭha country was now divided into four revenue districts (*shiqq*), over each of which was placed an official who could be trusted to enforce the emperor's demands. The new system of administration aroused in the Dakan much murmuring, which the feeble 'Ālim-al-Mulk was utterly unable to suppress. The roads between the Dakan and Dihlī were so disturbed that no treasure could be remitted to the capital from Daulatābād, where the money accumulated in the citadel was a tempting and easy prey, as we shall see, to any rebel who had the hardihood to seize it.

Towards the end of the year (745) in which Qutluḡh Khān was recalled from Daulatābād, 'Azīz Khammār¹ was dispatched

¹ In the *Bibliotheca Indica* text of Baranī 'Azīz is styled Hīmār ("the Ass"). In the Cairo text of Ibn Baṭūṭah, the *Bibliotheca Indica* text of

Ramaẓān, A.H. 745, the news of the sedition and rebellion of the centurions of Dabhoī and Baroda, of their revolt against Muqbil (*sic*), the deputy minister in Gujarāt, of the plundering of the horses and treasure, and of the defeat of Muqbil, reached Sultān Muḥammad in the city (Dihlī), and Sultān Muḥammad was rendered anxious by the news of this very serious rebellion, and he proposed to march in person to Gujarāt in order to quell it."

Qutluḡ Khān, in a petition presented through Baranī, deprecated the emperor's marching in person against the rebels, and volunteered for the duty, but Muḥammad was obstinate. Baranī continues (509): "The Sultān appointed to the regency the present emperor, Firūz Shāh, Malik Kabīr, and Aḥmad-i-Ayyāz (Khvāja Jahān), came forth from the *Kūshk-i-Humāyūn*, and alighted at Sultānpūr, which is fifteen *kurūh* from the city. As three or four days yet remained of Ramaẓān he halted in Sultānpūr." That is to say, in order to avoid marching during the fast Muḥammad halted until Shawwāl 1, 745 (February 5, 1345). Baranī adds that during the halt at Sultānpūr the emperor consulted him personally on the causes and remedies of rebellions.

While at Sultānpūr Muḥammad was annoyed by the news that 'Azīz Khammār had taken the field against the rebellious centurions of Gujarāt. 'Azīz, he said, was no soldier, and was courting disaster. His apprehensions were almost immediately confirmed by the news that 'Azīz had been defeated and killed. Baranī is habitually careless and inaccurate in his chronology, but there is hardly any possibility of error here. He is writing of events in which he participated and he is precise in the date which he assigns to them, which was probably fixed in his memory by the reason for the halt at Sultānpūr and the occurrence; before the emperor marched, of the great festival of the *Īd-al-Fiṭr*. He also receives partial corroboration from the poet Badr-i-Chāch.

It is, however, possible to prove, by means of a catalogue of the events which occurred between the emperor's departure

to Daulatābād and the assembly of all the centurions of the Dakan at least three months should be allowed.

7. The two *amirs*, with the centurions, left Daulatābād, but at the first stage from the city the centurions grew apprehensive, slew the two *amirs*, returned to the city, imprisoned the governor, and proclaimed Malik Muḥḥ the Afghān king of the Dakan.

8. Muhammad, on hearing of the rebellion at Daulatābād, marched thither, arriving, say, six weeks after the rebellion had broken out, defeated the rebels in the field, and afterwards besieged them in the fortress for three months.

9. Muhammad was recalled to Gujarāt by news of the rebellion of Malik Taghī, and marched from Daulatābād, leaving a force to besiege the fortress.

10. Two or three months after his return to Gujarāt, Muhammad received news of the defeat of his army before Daulatābād and the proclamation on Rabī‘al-ṣānī 24, A.H. 748 (August 13, 1347) of ‘Alā-al-dīn Bahman Shāh as king of the Dakan.¹

We thus have, roughly, about a year and a half to account for between Muhammad’s departure from Dihlī and the proclamation of Bahman Shāh in the Dakan. To this we must add a period for Muhammad’s stay in Bahroch, which was evidently of some duration, for while he was there he undertook the reform of the administration of Gujarāt and the collection of several years’ arrears of land revenue. If, as Budāonī and Firishtā say, the rebellion of the “centurions” of Gujarāt did not occur until A.H. 748, we have less than four months, even supposing the rebellion to have broken out on Muḥarram 1, into which to fit all the events enumerated above. Baranī’s dates allow two years, six months, and twenty-four days—a reasonable period for the occurrence of all the events and for the emperor’s prolonged stay at

¹ Another authority gives Sha‘bān 28, 748 (Dec. 3, 1347) as the date of this event, but the earlier date is usually accepted. The adoption of the later date would not affect the argument.

Baranī says: "He spent three rainy seasons in Gujarāt. One (June to October, 1348) he spent in Mandal-Pātrī,¹ and during that rainy season the emperor was employed in improving the administration of Gujarāt, and in organizing his army. The second rainy season (June to October, 1349) he spent in the neighbourhood of the fortress of Gīrnār (Junagadh), and when the chief of Gīrnār saw the strength of the victorious army and the magnificence of the great host, he purposed to capture the disloyal wretch, Taghī, alive, and to surrender him. When Taghī discovered this secret design he fled from there and went to Tattah, where he joined the Jām of Tattah; and when the rainy season was over the emperor captured Gīrnār, and brought under his own administration the coasts and islands of that region; and the *rānas* and chiefs came to court and made their submission and received robes of honour and rewards, and in Gīrnār Khengār (the Rāo of Kachh) and the *rāna* of Gīrnār were captured and brought to court, and the whole of that country was annexed. The third rainy season (June to October, 1350) Sultān Muḥammad spent in Gondal.² Now this Gondal is a village in the direction of Tattah of the Sūmarus and Maṛīla, and in Gondal the Sultān fell sick, and fever oppressed him, and he halted for some time while the sickness lasted. . . . Then the Sultān recovered from his sickness and marched with his whole army from Gondal until he reached the bank of the Indus, and crossed the river at his leisure with his army and elephants, and Ultūn Bahādur, with four or five thousand Mughul horse belonging to Amīr Farḡhan joined the emperor. . . . When Sultān Muḥammad, with his countless host, moved towards Tattah and arrived within thirty *kurāḥ* of that place it was the *‘Īshūrā* (Muḥarram 10, A.H. 752 = March 9, 1351), and the Sultān fasted, and when he broke his fast he ate fish, and it disagreed with him, and his sickness returned and again fever

¹ Two towns immediately to the east of the Little Rann. . Mandal is in 23° 16' N. and 71° 55' E. and Pātrī is in 25° 10' N. and 71° 48' E.

² In Kathiāwār, situated in 21° 58' and 70° 48' E.

A.H. 732 (A.D. 1331-2).

Muḥammad at Daulatābād.

A.H. 733 (A.D. 1332-3).

Muḥammad returns from Daulatābād to Dihlī.

Expedition into the Dūāb and devastation of the districts of Baran, Kananj, and Dalmau.

A.H. 734 (A.D. 1333-4).

Muḥammad at Kananj and Dalmau.

September 12, 1333, Ibn Baṭūṭah arrives at the mouth of the Indus.

‘Imād-al-Mulk Sartiz governor of Sind and Multān and Quṭb-al-Mulk governor of the city of Multān.

Ibn Baṭūṭah arrives at Dihlī.

June 8, 1334, Muḥammad returns to Dihlī.

Ziyā-al-dīn Baranī enters the service of Muḥammad Tughluq.

A.H. 735 (A.D. 1334-5).

January 5, 1335, Muḥammad leaves Dihlī to quell the rebellion of Jalāl-al-dīn Aḥsan Shāh in Maḍura.

Famine in Dihlī.

Muḥammad reaches Daulatābād and levies supplies, enhancing the assessment in the Marāṭha country.

Famine in the Dakan.

Muḥammad advances into Talingāna.

Khyāja Jahān returns to Dihlī.

Rebellion of Hulājūn and Gul Chandar the Khokhar in Lāhor. Tātār Khān, governor of Lāhor, slain.

A.H. 736 (A.D. 1335-6).

Rebellion in Lāhor quelled by Khyāja Jahān. Hulājūn slain.

Muḥammad reaches Warangal but is compelled by a pestilence in his army to retreat.

Malik Qubūl appointed governor of Warangal.

Shibāb-al-dīn Nuṣrat Khān appointed governor of Bīdar.

“Dome of the Tooth” built at Bīr.

Reports of Muḥammad’s death and rebellion of Malik Hūshang in Daulatābād.

Rebellion of Sayyid Ibrāhīm the Pursebearer, in Hānsī.

Muḥammad returns to Daulatābād and halts there.

Qutluḡ Khān appointed governor of Daulatābād.

A.H. 737 (A.D. 1336-7).

July, 1337, Muḥammad returns to Dihlī.

Severe famine in Dihlī.

Issue of loans to cultivators.

Execution of Sayyid Ibrāhīm the Pursebearer.

Foundation of Sargadwārī.

Rebellion of Nuṣrat Khān in Bīdar quelled by Qutluḡ Khān.

A.H. 738 (A.D. 1337-8).

Muhammad at Sargadwari.

Disastrous expedition into the Himālaya.

Permanent buildings replace booths at Sargadwari.

A.H. 739 (A.D. 1338-9).

Muhammad at Sargadwari.

Return of the remnant of the army of the Himālaya.

Death of Bahān Khan in Samargand. Malik Fakhr al-din *Siddiq* assumes independence and is proclaimed Fakhr al-din Muḥammad Shah. He attacks Qadr Khan in Lakhnawati, but is repulsed.

A.H. 740 (A.D. 1339-40).

Fakhr al-din Muḥammad Shah again attacks Qadr Khan in Lakhnawati, slays him, and becomes master of both Eastern and Western Bengal.

Rebellion of 'Alī Shah in Gujaraṭ and Roder.

Rebellion of 'Ain-al-Mulk. Battle of Kanauj.

Pilgrimage to Bahāūdīn.

Muhammad returns to Dihli.

A.H. 741 (A.D. 1340-1).

Mission to al-Mustafī, 'Alī al-dīn Caliph in Egypt.

Coins struck in the name of al-Mustafī.

'Ain-al-Mulk and 'Alī Shah pardoned. The latter is banished to Ghazni but afterwards returns to India and is executed.

Arrival of the 'Abbāsīd Ghiyāsal-dīn, "the *Mahmūd-zāda* of Baghdād," at Dihli.

Rebellion of Shāhū Izālī the Afghan in Multān.

Muhammad marches to quell the rebellion.

A.H. 742 (A.D. 1341-2).

Muhammad, on reaching Dīpāl-pūr, learns that Shāhū has fled and returns to Dihli.

A.H. 743 (A.D. 1342-3).

Muhammad at Dihli. Famine.

Šafar 17 (July 22, 1342), Ibn Baṭūṭah leaves Dihli.

Disturbances and revolts throughout the Duāb.

A.H. 744 (A.D. 1343-4).

Muhammad's expedition into the districts of Sunām, Sāmāna, Kaithal, and Guhrām.

Arrival in Dihli of Ḥājī Sa'īd Šarṣarī, envoy from the 'Abbāsīd Caliph, al-Ḥākim II.

Ḥājī Rajab Burqa'ī sent to Egypt as envoy to the Caliph.

A.H. 745 (A.D. 1344-5).

Rebellion of Nizām-al-Mulk (Sultān 'Alā'al-dīn) in Kara, suppressed by Shahr Allāh, brother of 'Ain-al-Mulk.

Decline in revenue receipts in the Dakan.

Shahbān I (December 8, 1344), Badr-i-Chāch leaves Dihli to recall Qutluḡ Khān from Daulatābād.

'Azīz Khammār appointed governor of Mālwa. Massacre of eighty "centurions" at Dhār.

Rebellion of the "centurions" of Dabhoī and Baroda.

Shawāl 1 (February 5, 1345), Muḥammad leaves Dihli (Sultānpūr) for Patan and Mount Ābn.

Expedition sent against the rebellious "centurions" of Dabhoī and Baroda.

A.H. 716 (A.D. 1315-6).

Suppression of the rebellion and flight of the "centurions" towards Daulatābād.

Muḥammad marches from Mount Ābn to Bahroch, which he makes his headquarters.

Pursuit of the "centurions", who are defeated on the Narbada.

Two inquisitors sent to Daulatābād.

Umeed in Daulatabad.

Kānḥayya (Kṛṣṇa) Nāik of Telingāna and Vīra Ballāla III of Dvāravatīpūra unite to expel the Muslims from Telingāna and the Camatic. Warangal recovered by Kṛṣṇa. Flight of 'Imād-al-Mulk Sartiz to Daulatabad. Kampli recovered by a son of its former rāja, who apostatizes from Islām.

Vīra Ballala III founds Vijayanagar.

Return of Ḥajjī Rajab Burqa'i with the Shaiḫ-al-Shujā'ī, envoy of al-Ḥākim II of Egypt.

A.H. 717 (A.D. 1316-7).

Two *amīrs* sent to Daulatābād to summon the "centurions" of the Dakan to Bahroch.

Revolt of the "centurions" of the Dakan.

Rebellion in Daulatabad. Ismā'il Muḥl the Afghān proclaimed king of the Dakan under the title of Nasir-al-dīn Shāh.

Muhammad marches to Daulatabad and besieges the fortress.

The "centurions" disperse to their districts. 'Imād-al-Mulk Sartiz sent to Gulbarga to attack the "centurions".

A.H. 718 (A.D. 1317-8).

Rebellion of Taghī in Gujarāt.

Muhammad returns to Gujarāt.

'Imād-al-Mulk Sartiz defeated and slain by the "centurions" in Gulbarga.

The "centurions" relieve Daulatābād.

Nasir-al-dīn Shāh abdicates.

Rabī' al-sānī 24 (August 13, 1317), Ḥasan Zafar Khān is elected King of the Dakan under the title of 'Alā al-dīn Bahman Shāh.

Muḥammad arrives at Bahroch. Taghī flees to Cambay. Yūsuf Bughīā defeated and slain at Cambay.

Muhammad marches to Cambay. Taghī flees to Asāwal (Aḥmadābād).

Muhammad marches to Asāwal. Taghī flees to Patan.

June, 1317. Rainy season sets in. Muḥammad halts for a month in Asāwal.

Taghī advances to Kadī but is defeated and flees to Patan, and thence to Khambāliya.

Muḥammad occupies Patan, where he learns of the proclamation of Bahman Shāh in Danlatābād.

Taghī takes refuge with the *rāna* of Girnār (Junagarh).

A.H. 749 (A.D. 1348-9).

Muḥammad has his headquarters in Mandal and Pātri.

October, 1348. Muḥammad marches to Girnār.

A.H. 750 (A.D. 1349-50).

Muḥammad encamped before Girnār.

Girnār is captured and the *rāna* and Khengūr, Rāo of Kachh, make their submission.

Taghī flees to Sind.

A.H. 751 (A.D. 1350-1).

Muḥammad, on his way to Sind, falls sick at Gondal, where he spends the rainy season (June to October, 1349).

The leading men of Dihlī are summoned to camp and large reinforcements are assembled from Dipālpūr, Multān, Uch, and Sihwān.

Muḥammad recovers and marches from Gondal to the Indus, where he is joined by a force of Mughuls.

A.H. 752 (A.D. 1351-2).

Muḥarram 21 (March 20, 1351). Muḥammad dies on the bank of the Indus, fourteen *kurūh* above Tattah.

V. *Parentage of the Child Enthroned in Dihlī by Khvājah Jahān after the Death of Muḥammad Tughluq*

Firūz ibn Rajab, Muḥammad's cousin, who had been left in Dihlī as one of the council of regency when the emperor left the capital for Gujarāt in February, 1345, had been summoned to the imperial camp at Gondal in 1349, and was with the army on the Indus when Muḥammad died.

The condition of the army after the emperor's death was deplorable. The troops were encumbered with their wives and families, who had been brought from Dihlī to Gondal and had accompanied the army to Sind, and had lost all spirit for fighting. The Mughul auxiliaries openly joined the enemy in plundering the camp, and the demoralized and leaderless host in the face of the enemy. The army, from the moment when Muḥammad breathed his last, urged Firūz to assume command of the army and proclaim himself emperor, but he exhibited a hesitating mind. He did not

justice, does not appear to have been feigned, and for two days resisted their importunity. On March 23, however, he gave way, was proclaimed emperor, and set himself to the performance of his arduous task. There was no longer any prospect of bringing the operations against Ṭaghī and the Jām to a successful conclusion, and all that he could hope to do was to withdraw the army, without disaster, from its perilous position. He succeeded, and the army began its retreat from Sind in safety, but not with honour. The treacherous Mughuls were bought off, the Sindīs were sufficiently intimidated to restrain them from attacking in force, and the army set out on its march to Dihlī.

The task which had lain before the new emperor was one from which a more resolute man might well have shrunk, but it is doubtful whether its difficulty is sufficient explanation of the readiness of Fīrūz to forgo a throne. It is possible that he did not regard himself as Muḥammad's heir.

Baranī says that Muḥammad had always had some intention of designating Fīrūz his heir, and fulfilled that intention on his death-bed. Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad says that the attention shown by Fīrūz to Muḥammad in his last illness so affected the latter that he made him his heir. Firīšta follows Baranī, and Budāonī says that "Fīrūz ascended the throne in accordance with the authority appointing him the heir of Sultān Muḥammad", and "by the consent of the chiefs of the *Shāikh*s and the leading *vazīrs* and *amīrs*". Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afif, in his *Tārīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī*, says that Muḥammad Tughluq treated Fīrūz with great kindness, and gave him special opportunities for becoming acquainted with the details of the administration of the empire, but does not say that he made him his heir.

Baranī's statement that Muḥammad on his death-bed made Fīrūz his heir is to some extent discounted by his obligation, as a court official, in both reigns, to represent the succession as being perfectly regular. He wrote when Fīrūz's ascent of the throne was a comparatively recent event and it was his

duty to record that it was not a usurpation. This could very easily be accomplished by representing a few kindly words spoken by a dying man as a nuncupative will.

The other contemporary, Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afif, wrote when Firūz had occupied the throne for many years and it was no longer necessary to justify an accomplished fact.

It may be doubted whether Firūz was Muḥammad's heir. He was his first cousin, the son of Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn's younger brother, Rajab; but Muḥammad had had five brothers, Bahrām Khān, Maḥmūd Khān, Mubārak Khān, Mas'ūd Khān, and Nuṣrat Khān. All of these princes are said by Baranī to have been living when Muḥammad Tughluq ascended the throne, though it is probable that Maḥmūd had shared the fate of his father. Mas'ūd was executed for treason. The fate of the others is not known, but they are not heard of during Muḥammad's reign. Nuṣrat Khān probably died during the reign or his title would not have been conferred on Shihāb-al-dīn, but Mubārak Khān, at least, seems to have been living when Firūz was proclaimed in Sind, and unless he had been blinded, a recognized disqualification, his claim was superior to that of Firūz. Nor is it certain that all the brothers of Muḥammad Tughluq died without male issue, and it is possible that Muḥammad himself left a son.

Budāonī tells a curious story, to which no reference is made by the contemporary historians, to the effect that during Muḥammad's absence in Gujarāt and before Firūz had joined him, Shaikh Naṣīr-al-dīn, Chirāgh-i-Dihlī, had secretly nominated Firūz as emperor, and that the nomination had been confirmed by the 'Abbāsīd Ghiyāṣ-al-dīn, known as "the *Makhḍūmzāda* of Baghdād". News of the conspiracy reached the emperor, and he summoned all three to the camp, and on their arrival issued orders for the immediate execution of the two holy men, and drank himself into a state of insensibility. Firūz, apparently, was only detained in custody. A son of Muḥammad had gone on a hunting expedition, and when the guards understood that the emperor was drunk and

his son absent, they liberated the three prisoners. Fīrūz then succeeded in making away, in some manner not mentioned, with Muḥammad's son, and "raised the banner of sovereignty". This improbable story, which is not mentioned by either of the contemporary historians, and for which Budāonī can cite no better authority than oral tradition, may be dismissed as apocryphal, but it suggests the existence of a legend to the effect that the succession of Fīrūz was not regular.

At Uch, on the way to Dihlī, news reached the army that Kḥyāja Jahān, the only member of Muḥammad's council of regency now remaining in the capital, for Malik Qatril was dead, had proclaimed as emperor in Dihlī Gḥiyās-al-dīn Maḥmūd (or Muḥammad) Shāh, a child of six or seven years of age, whom he represented to be a son of Muḥammad Tughluq. Baranī describes the child as "an unknown bastard", and is followed by Budāonī, Firishta, and Nizām-al-dīn Aḥmad, who describe him as "an obscure child" and "a child of obscure origin". Baranī, then, reflecting the views of the army, proceeds to heap abuse on Kḥyāja Jahān for his treason and rebellion.

Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afif, on the other hand, casts no aspersion on the birth of the child, and absolves Kḥyāja Jahān from blame in the matter, though he admits that the proclamation was an unfortunate mistake. The facts of the case as related to him by Kishvar Kḥān, son of Bahrām Aiba, Kishlū Khān, were that when, on Muḥammad's death, the Mughul auxiliaries plundered the great bazar of the imperial camp, Malīḥ Tūntūn, a confidential slave whom Kḥyāja Jahān had sent to Muḥammad, was so overcome with fear that he fled to Dihlī and reported that Muḥammad Tughluq was dead, that the Mughuls had plundered the bazar and attacked the army, that there had been much bloodshed, that Tātār Kḥān and Fīrūz had disappeared, and that most of the *maliks* had been killed. Malīḥ was a trusted slave and Kḥyāja Jahān believed his report and mourned alike for Muḥammad and

Firūz, whom he loved as a son. He then, in all good faith, according to 'Afif, placed the infant son of Muḥammad on the throne. 'Afif himself says not a word suggesting that the child was supposititious, but admits that the *amīrs* of the army asserted that Muḥammad had left no son.

Khyāja Jahān having placed the infant on the throne immediately raised in Dihlī an army of 20,000 horse to support him and maintain order, and on learning that Firūz was alive and was advancing with an army on Dihlī, refused to recede from the position which he had taken up, and sent envoys to Firūz to inform him that he had proclaimed Muḥammad's son in Dihlī, and to invite him to assume the regency. Those writers who maintain that the child set up by Khyāja Jahān was supposititious represent him as bitterly regretting his precipitancy, and as persisting in the course which he adopted under the impression that rebellion was the one unpardonable sin, and that there could be no forgiveness for him.

unquestionably his heir, but this circumstance has the appearance of a subsequent fabrication. Nobody was more likely than Fīrūz to know whether Muḥammad had left a son or not, and consultation with courtiers on this subject would have been unnecessary. The account of the consultation of Fīrūz with the doctors of the law is more convincing. They omitted all mention of the authenticity of the child's birth or the merits of Fīrūz's hereditary claim to the throne and merely decided that the first claimant of the throne was the fitter to fill it. Their omission to consider the case in its legal aspect, which was peculiarly their business, is significant, and if it had been certain that the child was not Muḥammad's there would have been no necessity to consult them.

It was soon apparent, even to Khvāja Jahān himself, that his case was hopeless. Qavām-al-Mulk, Khān Jahān Maqbūl, the most powerful *amīr* in the capital, fled from the city and joined Fīrūz, and by the time the army reached Hānsī Khvāja Jahān, disregarding the advice of his friends resolved to appear before Fīrūz before he entered the city and to seek a pardon. After the camp had left Hānsī he appeared before Fīrūz as a suppliant, bareheaded, and with a chain and a naked sword suspended from his neck, and was kindly received. The badges of guilt were removed, a turban was bound on his head, and Fīrūz assured him that he had never believed that he had acted otherwise than in good faith. He was intent, not only on pardoning, but on reinstating him, his eighty years notwithstanding, in the office of *vazīr*, and was only deterred from fulfilling his benevolent intention by the vehement protests of the *maliks* and *amīrs* against such misplaced leniency. They drew a lurid picture of what their own fate would have been had Khvāja Jahān defeated the army, and were evidently resolved that he should suffer the punishment due to rebellion. The unpardonable crime, in their eyes, was probably the dissipation of much of the treasure which they had expected to share. Fīrūz was unwilling to abandon his old friend and colleague, and held out

victim of the animosity of the officers of the army, to which Fīrūz basely abandoned him.

For the weakness of Fīrūz there is no excuse, but his usurpation may be defended on the ground on which Germany defended her perfidious attack on Belgium, that of necessity. Muḥammad's death in the camp and in the face of the enemy had completely demoralized an already disheartened army. The Oriental is not familiar with the principle of delegated authority, and it is probable that nothing but the prestige of an emperor, present in the midst of the army, could have saved it from dissolution.

